
1

Action Item

California Postsecondary Education Commission

Approval of the Minutes of the October 8, 2002, Meeting

MINUTES

California Postsecondary Education Commission

Meeting of October 8, 2002

**Commissioners
present** Alan S. Arkatov *Chair*
Carol Chandler, *Vice Chair*
George T. Caplan
Irwin S. Field
Susan Hammer
Odessa P. Johnson
Ralph R. Pesqueira
Evonne Seron Schulze
Rachel E. Shetka
Olivia K. Singh
Faye Washington
Howard Welinsky

**Commissioners
absent**
Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr.
Anthony M. Vitti
Melinda G. Wilson

Call to order The October 8, 2002, meeting of the California Postsecondary Education Commission was called to order by Chair, Alan S. Arkatov, at 1:15 p.m.

Call of the roll Executive Secretary Anna Gomez called the roll. All Commissioners were present except Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr., Anthony M. Vitti, and Melinda Wilson.

Consent calendar Chair Arkatov called for a motion to approve the minutes of meetings held on July 22, 2002.

On the motion made by Commissioner Field, seconded by Commissioner Johnson, and carried unanimously, the following Consent Calendar items were approved with one correction to the spelling of Commissioner Schulze's name as contained under Tab 5 – Educational Policy and Programs Committee.

Item 2: Minutes of July 22, 2002 Commission meeting

Item 3: Minutes of July 22, 2002 Governmental Relations Committee meeting

Item 4: Minutes of July 22, 2002 Fiscal Policy and Analysis Committee meeting

Item 5: Minutes of July 22, 2002 Educational Policy and Programs Committee meeting

Report on Executive Session Chair Arkatov reported on the discussion at the Executive Session held earlier in the day during which time Executive Director Moore detailed the State's budget issues and their impact on the Commission's workload and staffing.

Chair Arkatov reaffirmed that the Commissioners were in agreement with solutions proposed by Executive Director Moore and that he had been commended for having made hard, but right decisions.

Report of the Chair

Presentation by CTC Executive Director Sam Swofford

Commission Chair Alan Arkatov introduced Mr. Sam Swofford, the Executive Director of the Commission on Teacher Credentialing (CTC). Mr. Swofford discussed the partnerships CTC has formed with entities across the state to help improve teacher training and professional development. He said that the critical challenge facing the state is growth in the numbers of students and an unprecedented demand for more and better trained teachers.

Mr. Swofford then discussed the potential role the California Community Colleges could play in alleviating the state's teacher shortage. Mr. Swofford said the colleges have a large pool of potential teachers and that greater effort is needed to integrate the community colleges into teacher training and professional development initiatives. He then spoke of the importance of developing quality data for use in accountability efforts since the state provides substantial resources to initiatives designed to have a coordinated effect on student performance.

Mr. Swofford concluded by calling for improved linkages between CTC and CPEC and for more community college involvement in teacher training and professional development.

Commissioners Hammer, Johnson, and Chair Arkatov, separately, discussed Mr. Swofford's points regarding collaboration with CPEC, the involvement of the community colleges, and improvements in the credentialing process, agreeing with his comments.

Chair Arkatov thanked Mr. Swofford for his presentation and conversation with the Commission.

State Legislative Update, October 2002

Commission staff member Marge Chisholm introduced the item by noting changes to the matrix contained under Tab 6 since the Agenda was mailed to the Commissioners.

- ◆ Item 9, Assembly Bill 2295 (Oropeza) was chaptered on September 29, 2002 and directs the Commission to contract with an independent source to assess how California institutions are complying with federal Title IX regulations with respect to participation levels of males and females in athletic scholarship programs. Funding for the study is contained in the Commission's FY 2002 budget.

- ♦ Item 11, Assembly Bill 2533 (Johnson) requiring colleges and universities to report on campus violence directs that this information to be provided via a website.
- ♦ Item 14, Senate Bill 631 (Polanco) to establish an exchange program between California and Mexico postsecondary institutions was vetoed by Governor Davis on September 29, 2002.

Commissioner Hammer asked why Senate Bill 631 had been vetoed. Ms. Chisholm responded that, no veto “message” explaining the reason was included in the Governor’s action.

At the request of Chair Arkatov, Ms. Chisholm reviewed with the Commissioners that, one year ago the Commission passed a resolution in support of a proposed bond measure to redress facility needs in public K-12 and higher education. At that time the measure had not been assigned a number or an amount.

After discussion, the Commissioners reaffirmed their earlier resolution and a motion was made by Commissioner Schulze, seconded by Commissioner Hammer and carried unanimously to issue a press release asserting the Commission’s support for Proposition 47, The Kindergarten-University Public Education Facilities Bond Act of 2002 on the November 5, 2002 California ballot.

A second bond issue, which would provide state-support for after-school K-12 programs, was described by Ms. Chisholm as a worthwhile and much-needed effort. However, staff had concerns relative to how Proposition 49 would be funded, especially in light of the current fiscal shortages facing the State. In addition, because the funds for Proposition 49 could come from the voter-approved set-aside for education under Proposition 98, there is the potential for a reduction in funding for the community college system under the Proposition 98 formula. After further discussion, the Commissioners concurred with Ms. Chisholm’s suggestion to withhold making a recommendation in light of these uncertainties.

Commissioner Hammer asked if Ms. Chisholm knew which organizations were on record as opposing Proposition 49. She responded that, to her knowledge she knew of two, the League of Women Voters and the California Federation of Teachers (CFT).

**Higher Education
Budget Update,
2002-2003**

Commission staff member Mr. Kevin Woolfork provided a summary and update on the recent passage of the California State Budget for the 2002-03 fiscal year, as described in Tab 7 of the agenda. He noted that the \$101 million budget addressed a \$24 billion gap with program cuts, loans and fund shifts, and some additional revenues. He referred the Commissioners to several data tables in the report that provide details of education spending in the budget.

Mr. Woolfork continued that the budget authorizes to make \$750 million in additional spending reductions and that more budget cuts are envisioned for later in the fiscal year. He said that current estimates are that the State still faces a budget shortfall of up to \$15 billion over the next 20 months.

Commissioner Chandler asked about the prospects of increases in resident student fee levels given the State's fiscal problems. Mr. Woolfork responded that at the present time there was no move to increase these fees, nor were Commission staff advocating such a policy. He noted that fees are only brought up in the budget report as an existing fund source. Mr. Woolfork did caution that with the State's deteriorating fiscal condition, there might be pressure on policy makers to increase fees to make up for some portion of the budget shortfall. He concluded by alluding to the Commission's current work in developing a long-term student fee policy as the preferred method of addressing student fee levels.

Commissioner Arkatov thanked Mr. Woolfork for his presentation.

**Policy Principles
Relating
to Resident
Student Charges
at California's
Public Universities**

Commission staff member Mr. Karl Engelbach presented this item, noting the assistance of an advisory committee. He said this report presents policy principles for Commission discussion. He stated that the Commission is not advocating for increases in student fees but rather to have in place a clear policy statement on student charges. Mr. Engelbach noted that the Supplemental Report Language calling for this study referred only to the State University and the University of California and excluded the Community Colleges.

In response to questions and comments from Commissioners Schulze and Hammer, Mr. Engelbach clarified the use of the term student "fees," as opposed to student "tuition," and noted that the Commission uses the term student "charges" in the report.

In discussion on points raised by Commissioners Caplan, Field, and Welinsky, Mr. Engelbach explained the suggested policy principle that revenues generated by student charges should remain in the education system in which they were generated and not used as an offset for intended State General Fund revenues. Mr. Engelbach continued that the Legislative Analyst's Office advocates for a methodology that would set student fee levels each year, but that the higher education systems disagree with this approach.

Commissioner Welinsky asked why the policy principle for graduate and professional program fees was worded in a more permissive manner than for other fees. Mr. Engelbach responded that the consensus was that the State University and University of California should have discretion for setting differential student fee levels for these programs.

Speakers from the audience included Ms. Karen Yelverton-Zamarripa of the California State University Office of the Chancellor and Ms. Catherine Mc Coy, a California Community Colleges advocate and California Faculty Association representative. Ms. Yelverton-Zamarripa commented on the State University's dire budget situation and suggested that flexibility was needed in student fee setting policy. Ms. Mc Coy requested that more students and faculty be involved in the advisory committee process.

Mr. Engelbach said the Commission was pleased to invite the additional representatives mentioned to join the advisory committee on this project. Chair Arkatov thanked Mr. Engelbach and the other representatives for their work on this project.

Issues and Challenges Confronted by Postsecondary Education Institutions in Providing Increased Postsecondary Education Opportunities to Residents of Superior California	<p>Commission staff member Mr. Karl Engelbach and project consultant Mr. William Storey presented this item, first providing background on the study and described the physical location of Superior California as being in the State's northern region. Mr. Engelbach discussed the access issues faced by residents of this area and said that these issues are not unique to this region of the state.</p> <p>Mr. Engelbach and Mr. Storey summarized the findings of a related study by MGT of America and their own preliminary findings on the areas population projections, economics and employment demand, college-going rates, and other data on the region. The presenters offered their preliminary conclusion that there is insufficient population and demand to warrant construction of a four-year public university in this region at present. They qualified this, noting the lack of educational services in the region, which frustrates efforts to determine the true demand for postsecondary educational opportunities.</p> <p>Commissioner Caplan asked many of the region's high school graduates had completed the coursework required for admission to the California State University and the University of California.</p> <p>The presenters indicated that this information would be added in the revised report to be brought back to the Commission in December. The presenters continued that there were various options for fulfilling the baccalaureate degree needs in Superior California, including the use of distance learning, joint facilities and degree programs between area community colleges and universities, improved articulation between community colleges and area universities.</p> <p>Commissioners Schulze and Field commented on this item, encouraging collaboration with CTC on this issue and examining the role that community colleges could play in meeting the educational needs of Superior California. They also raised questions on the possibility of community colleges offering joint bachelor's degrees and on Cal Grant awards for transfer students.</p> <p>California Community Colleges Chancellor's Office representative Ms. Diana Michel-Fuentes then spoke on the potential of community colleges to offer joint bachelor's degrees in cooperation with four-year institutions, citing the recent collaboration of Canada College and San Francisco State University.</p> <p>Chair Arkatov thanked the presenters for their work on this report.</p>
--	--

Report of the Statutory Advisory Committee	<p>Todd Greenspan, chair of the Committee, first encouraged the Commission's support of the upcoming Proposition 47, the education bond issue, and then detailed the public postsecondary systems' current numbers of over enrolled students -- students for which they receive no State funding. He then mentioned the meetings convened by the Legislative Analyst's Office to help shape the Commission's future priorities, speaking of the need for a strong Commission.</p> <p>Mr. Greenspan presented the recommendations of the Statutory Advisory Committee for the functions and responsibilities of CPEC and said that the Commission can be a unique voice for higher education.</p>
---	--

Ms. Karen Yelverton-Zamarripa, the Statutory representative of the California State University Office of the Chancellor, testified that the main point of the Statutory Advisory Committee's work is that the State's higher education enterprise needs CPEC, particularly in the current environment. She continued, stating, "less is better," to help maintain the quality of work within the Commission's current resources. She concluded by suggesting that each Commission report contain an implementation plan to help put its recommendations into effect.

Mr. Greenspan added that the Statutory Advisory Committee was also re-examining its role to determine how it can be more effective in assisting the Commission with its work.

**Report of the
Executive Director**

Commission Executive Director Moore began by calling on staff member Adrian Griffin to provide a brief update on the Commission's Eligibility Study. Mr. Griffin noted the progress the Commission has had in getting the needed information from the State's high schools. He said that 1,200 of the 1,500 high schools had responded, providing the Commission with 12,000 of the 16,000 anticipated high school transcripts. He noted that the follow-up was very time consuming for staff and that 25 percent of the packets received from the high schools contained errors.

Commissioner Schulze complimented staff on achieving this response rate. Mr. Griffin replied that staff hoped to at least meet, and hopefully better, the 90 percent response rate of previous Commission Eligibility studies.

Executive Director Moore then stated that this project was long and time-intensive and that there are further issues to be worked out with the State University and University on analyzing the high school transcripts. He said that this project was an important one for the Commission and that he had decided to go forward with it even with the Commission's resource constraints.

Executive Director Moore next asked staff member Murray Haberman to update the Commission on the study of nursing programs called for in SB 644. Mr. Haberman provided a summative background on the study and said that the preliminary final report would contain suggested solutions to the State's nursing shortage.

Commission Caplan asked whether the study analyzes the attrition rates of nurses. He also noted the importance of math courses in the nursing curriculum.

Mr. Haberman responded that the report would look at attrition rates and the reasons behind these rates.

Executive Director Moore then asked Mr. Haberman to update the Commission's study of cross enrollments at the public higher education systems. Mr. Haberman provided background on this study, noting that the systems report there was minimal participation in this program. He said that the preliminary report to be presented to the Commission in December would evaluate the effectiveness of the cross-enrollment program.

Executive Director Moore thanked Mr. Haberman and staff for their work and said he would report on other work items at subsequent Commission meetings.

**Proposed
Commission
Meeting Dates for
2003 and 2004**

Deputy Director David Leveille presented the proposed meeting dates to the Commission. Chair Arkatov explained that the Commission will try to have one-day, full-day meetings and that they will be held in Sacramento through the end of 2004.

Commissioner Schulze suggested that Tuesdays are better for full-day meetings than Mondays and Commissioner Arkatov agreed. Commissioner Singh also suggested that meetings begin slightly later in the mornings.

Mr. Leveille thanked the Commission for its input and said that a final version of this item would come back to the Commission for action in December.

**Report of the
Nominating
Committee**

Chair Arkatov called for the report of the Nominating Committee. Committee Chair Welinsky presented the following slate for action at the December, 2002, Commission meeting:

Commission Chair: Alan S. Arkatov

Commission Vice Chair: Howard Welinsky

Executive Committee Chair: Alan S. Arkatov

Executive Committee Vice Chair: Howard Welinsky

Educational Policy and Programs Committee: Carol Chandler, *Chair*, Susan Hammer, *Vice Chair*

Fiscal Policy and Analysis Committee: Olivia K. Singh, *Chair*, Irwin S. Field, *Vice Chair*

Governmental Relations Committee: Evonne Seron Schulze, *Chair*, Faye Washington, *Vice Chair*

Committee on Education Code Section 66905: Guillermo Rodriguez, Jr., *Chair*

Nominating Committee: Olivia K. Singh, *Chair*, Carol Chandler, and Irwin S. Field, *Members*.

Adjournment

There being no further business, the Chair called for adjournment of the meeting at 4:15 p.m.
